1 2 3 4 5 6	NANCY L. ABELL (SB# 88785) nancyal ELENA R. BACA (SB# 160564) elenabach HEATHER A. MORGAN (SB# 177425) PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WAIS 515 South Flower Street Twenty-Fifth Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071-2228 Telephone: (213) 683-6000 Facsimile: (213) 627-0705 Attorneys for Defendant CINTAS CORPORATION	na@naulhactings.com	
8	Plaintiffs' Counsel Listed on Next Page		
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
11	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
12	ROBERT RAMIREZ, ROBERT	G 4 G 7 3 4 6 G 4 6 G 6 1 4 G 7 1 4 G	
13	HARRIS, LUIS POCASANGRE CARDOZA, JOSE SALCEDO, A.	CASE NO. C04-0281-JSW	
14	SHAPPELLE THOMPSON, CORETTA SILVERS (formerly	[RELATED TO CASE NO. C05-03145-JSW]	
15 16	VICK), SANDRA EVANS, BLANCA NELLY AVALOS, JAMES MORGAN and ANTHONY JONES, on behalf of	JOINT STIPULATION OF DISMISSAL OF PLAINTIFF CORETTA VICK'S (AKA CORETTA SILVERS) INDIVIDUAL CLAIMS WITH	
17	themselves and all others similarly situated,	PREJUDICE AND HER PUTATIVE CLASS CLAIM ON BEHALF OF	
18	Plaintiffs,	CURRENT AND FORMER AFRICAN AMERICAN NON-EXEMPT	
19	vs.	EMPLOYEES (EXCEPT SSR'S) WITH RESPECT TO PAY WITHOUT	
20	CINTAS CORPORATION,	PREJUDICE AND [PROPOSED] ORDER	
21	Defendant.		
22			
23		Date: December 14, 2007 Time: 9:00 a.m.	
24	EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION,	Dept: Courtroom 2, 17 th Floor	
25		Hon. Jeffrey S. White	
26	Plaintiff/Intervenor.		
27			
28		JOINT STIPULATION OF DISMISSAL OF	

JOINT STIPULATION OF DISMISSAL OF PLAINTIFF CORETTA VICK'S CLAIMS AND [PROPOSED ORDER]

1	MORRIS J. BALLER (SB# 048928) mballer@gdblegal.com ROBERTA L. STEELE (SB# 188198) rsteele@gdblegal.com
2	JOSEPH E. JARAMILLO (SB# 178566) jjaramillo@gdblegal.com GOLDSTEIN, DEMCHAK, BALLER,
3	BORGEN & DARDÁRIAN 300 Lakeside Dr., Suite 1000
5	Oakland, CA 94612 Telephone: (510) 763-9800 Facsimile: (510) 835-1417
6	BETTY EBERLE (SB# 196914)
7	beberle@LAWMBG.com MINER, BARNHILL & GALLAND 44 E. Mifflin Street, Suite 803
8	Madison, WI 53703
9	Telephone: (608) 255-5200 Facsimile: (608) 255-5380
10	Attorneys for Plaintiffs ROBERT RAMIREZ, et al.
11	
12	
13	
14	·
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	JOINT STIPULATION OF DISMISSAL OF
	JOINT STIPULATION OF DISMISSAL OF

Case No. C04-0281-JSW

10562-3

JOINT STIPULATION OF DISMISSAL OF PLAINTIFF CORETTA VICK'S CLAIMS AND [PROPOSED]

RECITALS

WHEREAS, on August 3, 2005, Plaintiff Coretta Vick aka Coretta Silvers ("Vick") filed her Fourth Amended Complaint ("FAC") asserting claims on behalf of herself and as a putative class representative for certain present and former employees of Defendant Cintas Corporation ("Cintas");

WHEREAS, in the FAC, Vick individually asserted claims under the Civil Rights Act of 1866, 42 U.S.C. §1981, as amended by the Civil Rights Act of 1991 ("Section 1981"), and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e, et seq., as amended ("Title VII"), specifically contending that Cintas paid Vick a lower hourly rate than white non-exempt office and clerical coworkers because of her race (black) (FAC ¶ 12);

WHEREAS, in the FAC, Vick sought to assert claims as a class representative on behalf of African American current and former non-exempt employees in Cintas' Rental Division who allegedly have been subjected to discriminatory compensation practices and paid less than similarly situated non-African American employees in violation of Section 1981 and Title VII (FAC ¶¶ 45-46, 48(e), 83(e); Joint Case Management Statement and Order Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 16-9, filed June 10, 2005, at 20);

WHEREAS, Vick is the only remaining named Plaintiff who has asserted class claims on behalf of any African American current and former non-exempt employees in Cintas' Rental Division who allegedly have been subjected to discriminatory compensation practices and paid less than similarly situated non-African American employees in violation of Section 1981 and Title VII, other than the claims asserted by James Morgan on behalf of African American SSR's;

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
12	
13	ļ
14	
15	
16	
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	,
24	Ļ
25	,
26	í
27	7

WHEREAS, on March 22, 2005, this Court ordered Vick to arbitrate her claims and stayed this action as to her claims pending completion of an arbitration proceeding in this judicial district;

WHEREAS, the parties thereafter commenced arbitration, *inter alia*, of Vick's claims before The Honorable Eugene Lynch (Ret.), who has issued a clause construction award but has not commenced proceedings on the merits of Vick's claims;

WHEREAS, Vick hereby dismisses with prejudice all of her individual claims alleged in the FAC;

WHEREAS, Vick thus is not an adequate class representative for any form of relief sought on behalf of the putative class of African American current and former non-exempt employees in Cintas' Rental Division who allegedly have been subjected to discriminatory compensation practices and paid less than similarly situated non-African American employees in violation of Section 1981 and Title VII, as described in paragraphs 45-46, 48(e) and 83(e) of the FAC;

WHEREAS, Vick has agreed to withdraw as a class representative and seeks the Court's permission to dismiss without prejudice her claims on behalf of the putative class of African American current and former non-exempt employees in Cintas' Rental Division who allegedly have been subjected to discriminatory compensation practices and paid less than similarly situated non-African American employees in violation of Section 1981 and Title VII, as described in paragraphs 45-46, 48(e) and 83(e) of the FAC, but not dismiss the claims asserted by James Morgan on behalf of African American SSR's, in exchange for Cintas' waiver of its right to recover costs against Vick pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d); and

28

WHEREAS, the parties have agreed that Plaintiffs' counsel will not include any attorneys' fees or costs incurred as part of maintaining Vick's individual claims or the class claims Vick has asserted, should they later apply for an award of attorneys' fees or costs in this litigation. However, if Plaintiffs or Plaintiffs' counsel apply for an award of attorneys' fees and costs, this stipulation will not preclude them from asserting that some portion of the time spent on the class claims asserted by Vick should be allocated to another claim on which Plaintiffs prevailed (for example, the claims asserted by James Morgan on behalf of African American SSR's, if Plaintiffs prevail on those claims); and nothing in this stipulation will preclude Defendant from asserting any legal arguments in opposition to such an allocation.

STIPULATION

THE PARTIES, BY AND THROUGH THEIR COUNSEL, HEREBY STIPULATE AS FOLLOWS:

- 1. Plaintiff Coretta Vick dismisses with prejudice all of her individual claims asserted in the FAC for discrimination in violation of Section 1981 and Title VII;
- 2. Plaintiff Vick withdraws as the named, representative plaintiff and dismisses without prejudice her claims on behalf of the putative class of African American current and former non-exempt employees in Cintas' Rental Division who allegedly have been subjected to discriminatory compensation practices and paid less than similarly situated non-African American employees in violation of Section 1981 and Title VII, as described in paragraphs 45-46, 48(e) and 83(e) of the FAC, other than the claims asserted by James Morgan on behalf of African American SSR's;

1	3. All claims in the FAC alleging that African American current and		
2	former non-exempt employees in Cintas' Rental Division have been subjected to		
3	discriminatory compensation practices and paid less than similarly situated non-African		
4	American employees in violation of Section 1981 and Title VII and all claims for relief		
5	for such discrimination are hereby dismissed without prejudice, except the claims asserted		
6	by James Morgan on behalf of African American SSR's;		
7			
8	4. Plaintiffs' counsel will not include any attorneys' fees or costs		
9	incurred as part of maintaining Vick's individual claims or the class claims Vick has		
10	asserted, should they later apply for an award of attorneys' fees or costs in this litigation.		
11	However, if Plaintiffs or Plaintiffs' counsel apply for an award of attorneys' fees and		
12	costs, this stipulation will not preclude them from asserting that some portion of the time		
13	spent on the class claims asserted by Vick should be allocated to another claim on which		
14	Plaintiffs prevailed (for example, the claims asserted by James Morgan, if Plaintiffs		
15	prevail on those claims); and nothing in this stipulation will preclude Defendant from		
16	asserting any legal arguments in opposition to such an allocation; and		
17			
18	5. Cintas waives its right to recover costs against Plaintiff Coretta Vick		
19	after the dismissal of her individual and putative class claims as permitted by Federal Rule		
20	of Civil Procedure 54(d).		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			

28

Case 3:04-cv-00281-JSW Document 236 Filed 12/14/07 Page 7 of 9

1		
1	DATED: October 30, 2007	Respectfully submitted,
2		D /-/ Dalamen I Stoole
3		By: /s/ Roberta L. Steele ROBERTA L. STEELE
4		Morris J. Baller Roberta L. Steele
5		Joseph E. Jaramillo GOLDSTEIN, DEMCHAK, BALLER, BORGEN &
6		DARDARIAN 300 Lakeside Drive, Suite 1000
7		Oakland, CA 94611 Phone: (510) 763-9800
8		Fax: (510) 835-1417
9		Betty Eberle
10		MINER, BARNHILL & GALLAND 44 E. Mifflin Street, Suite 803
11		Madison, WI 53703 Phone: (608) 255-5200
12		Facsimile: (608) 255-5380
13		Counsel for Plaintiffs Robert Ramirez, et al.
14	DATED: October 30, 2007	
15		By: /s/ Nancy L. Abell NANCY L. ABELL
16		
17		Nancy L. Abell Elena R. Baca
18		Heather A. Morgan PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP
19		515 South Flower Street, 25th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90071-2228
20		Phone: (213) 683-6000 Fax: (213) 627-0705
21		Counsel for Defendant Cintas Corporation
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		TODIT CTIDLII ATION OF DISMISS ALOF
		JOINT STIPULATION OF DISMISSAL OF

1 2

ORDER

BASED ON THE PARTIES' STIPULATION AND GOOD CAUSE
APPEARING THEREFORE, this Court DISMISSES WITH PREJUDICE Plaintiff
Coretta Vick's individual claims that Cintas has discriminated against her in violation of
Section 1981 and Title VII.

This Court further finds that Plaintiff Coretta Vick is not an adequate class representative and may not represent the alleged class of African American current and former non-exempt employees in Cintas' Rental Division who contend they have been subjected to discriminatory compensation practices and paid less than similarly situated non-African American employees in violation of Section 1981 and Title VII, as described in paragraphs 45-46, 48(e) and 83(e) of the FAC;

This Court further finds that Plaintiff Coretta Vick is the only remaining named, representative plaintiff on behalf of the putative class of African American current and former non-exempt employees in Cintas' Rental Division who allegedly have been subjected to discriminatory compensation practices and paid less than similarly situated non-African American employees in violation of Section 1981 and Title VII, as described in paragraphs 45-46, 48(e) and 83(e) of the FAC and that Plaintiff seeks dismissal without prejudice of these putative class claims, but not the class claims filed by James Morgan on behalf of African American SSR's. On this basis the Court DISMISSES WITHOUT PREJUDICE all claims in the FAC alleging that African American current and former non-exempt employees in Cintas' Rental Division have been subjected to discriminatory compensation practices and paid less than similarly situated non-African American employees in violation of Section 1981 and Title VII and all claims for relief for such discrimination, but not the class claims filed by James Morgan on behalf of African American SSR's.

The Court also finds that Plaintiffs' counsel is not entitled to recover any 1 amount in attorneys' fees and costs attributable to pursuing Vick's individual claims 2 3 herein or her class claims in the FAC alleging that African American current and former non-exempt employees in Cintas' Rental Division have been subjected to discriminatory 4 5 compensation practices and paid less than similarly situated non-African American employees in violation of Section 1981 and Title VII. 6 7 The parties have agreed that Plaintiffs' counsel will not include any 8 attorneys' fees or costs incurred as part of maintaining Vick's individual claims or the 9 10 class claims Vick has asserted, should they later apply for an award of attorneys' fees or 11 costs in this litigation. However, if Plaintiffs or Plaintiffs' counsel apply for an award of 12 attorneys' fees and costs, this stipulation and order will not preclude them from asserting 13 that some portion of the time spent on the class claims asserted by Vick should be allocated to another claim on which Plaintiffs prevailed (for example, the class claims 14 filed by James Morgan on behalf of African American SSR's, if Plaintiffs prevail on those 15 claims); and nothing in this stipulation and order will preclude Defendant from asserting 16 17 any legal arguments in opposition to such an allocation. 18 Finally, the Court finds that Cintas may not recover costs against Plaintiff 19 Coretta Vick as it would be otherwise permitted by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(d). 20 21 IT IS SO ORDERED. 22 23 24 DATED; December 14 2007 25 26 27 28